

January 15, 1976

hearing, so to speak, in the early part of the year so that a greater number of them who are running would find out they didn't have a following, and therefore, they could be taken out early in the year and not have to spend money campaigning the rest of the year until September? Did you find this not to be an advantage?

SENATOR KOCH: I am not sure that I understand your question, Senator Swigart. Would you restate it?

SENATOR SWIGART: Yes, the question is, in your studies, didn't you find it to be an advantage to a candidate who starts to run possibly January 1st to get a hearing from the public early in the year so that he can find out that he doesn't have a following or that he does so that he don't have to campaign all year?

SENATOR KOCH: This would not prevent any candidate from trying to determine what his ground swell is, as the term is used, and many times it is only your wife and maybe your son, and beyond that point, it is always questionable. This would not deny that candidate to determine what his strength may be by moving the primary to September. It wouldn't be any different that it is basically now as it is in May because you start testing the water, if you are a serious candidate, possibly, the preceding year. It doesn't deny you a test to determine what your strength may be.

SENATOR SWIGART: But the most advantageous test is to have a hearing from the public, and I thought, if you had it in May, then you wouldn't have to spend money from May to September if you didn't have a following.

SENATOR KOCH: What is the difference of spending money from, say, the previous November until May when they make the final determination of whether you are going to be a finalist or not?

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, whenever we deal with a political issue, we know often there is an admixture of good and bad, evil and goodness. Now we can try to be alchemists and make gold out of base metal but very seldom are we successful. There is always going to be some base metal left in it. I find provisions in the bill that I don't particularly care for but I also find some things in it that are attractive to me. Being an independent, independent is spelled with a small "i". If you belong to a political party, they spell it with a capital because the capital letter indicates that you belong to an organization, and notice I say, you belong to an organization. The organization does not belong to you. You are owned. You are possessed. But as an independent with a small "i", it is an adjective. It is something which is attached to you to describe an attitude or a frame of mind that you have so the cross over provision which would allow independents to vote in either party's fiasco, I think is very attractive, and regardless of what my motive for voting for a candidate is, that should have nothing to do with determining what procedures are established for allowing me to vote or not to vote. A Democrat could switch over to a Republican for the purpose of doing the same thing, voting in the Republican primary, well, whichever way I put it, he switches party to vote in a weak candidate so that his preference could whip him. Well, we know all these things happen.